

Date: Sat, 5 Feb 94 04:30:14 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #40
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 5 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 40

Today's Topics:

I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 4 Feb 1994 22:41:08 GMT
From: spool.mu.edu!olivea!charnel!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!
news.umbc.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!csn@munnnari.oz.au
Subject: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <syR9gc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill
N8PKV) writes:

>From: dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV)
>Subject: Re: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
>Keywords: CW
>Date: Fri, 04 Feb 94 16:24:03 EST

>>

>> What I wanted to say Dan is I'm getting sick of all the crying about how
>> unfair it is to have a requirement to know CW to use SSB. The FCC in all thei
>> infinite wisdom have allocated 11 meters SSB to those who DO NOT wish to
>> spend the time learning morse code.

>11 Meters is NOT a ham band and if you refer to the CB spectrum, that

>was and is NOT intended for long distance communication. Are you
>suggesting that the best thing to do is not work to change the rules
>within the law but BREAK THE LAW?

>(CW Lid filter in action.)

>> I work CW on the air almost every night.
>> My passing a 5wpm test has given me the privilege to use 200khz of the
>> spectrum below 50Mhz for SSB. I earned that privilege and
>> everybody who went before me earned that privilege.

>I had to do it so you have to do it despite the FACT that it isn't
>relevent.

>> Too Many people in this
>> world want everything given to them. I did not go to Medical School but do I
>> have the right to cry about the fact that I'm not earning \$100k plus.

>Where is it written that one must EARN an amateur radio license. You
>must pass the required tests to prove that you have skills and knowleage
>relevent to what you will be doing. To protect yourself and others.
>Hazing (requiring things not applicible just to 'earn' it) is not
>acceptable to some. And not the reason the FCC tests for an amateur
>license.

>>
>> Dan I'm sorry I made a personal attack. I hope you understand that to me
>> this code thing is a challenge and what many people are saying would not only
>> take away that challenge but would make the hobby much less attractive. If yo
>> could become an EXTRA class ham in an afternoon, wouldn't that diminish the
>> value of getting an EXTRA class license?

>No. Not if the person passed tests relevent to the purposes of amateur
>radio. (Have you ever read part 97?)

>How can having more people to talk to and a greater voice in government
>make ham radio less attractive?

>Dan Pickersgill N8PKV - dan@mystis.wariat.org - ac447@po.cwru.edu

Ya know Dan if you are so all fired hot about this hobby, then why is it
that you got your license in July of 1991 and you haven't advanced beyond
Technician? Could it be that you are going to spend your time crying about
how unfair the rules are and hope that they will reduce the requirements for
upgrade to your level?

Put your energy into study it could be far less futile.

73's

Patrick Tatro NOWCG (a Technician who wants to be an EXTRA some day)

Date: 5 Feb 1994 01:57:25 -0600

From: tadpole.com!news.dell.com!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!
sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CKoDx2.ALv@ucdavis.edu>, <2isk9b\$8ce@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<CKq1Fu.Fq7@ucdavis.edu>o.uh.

Subject : Re: Guns and 02 (was Re: Antenna Lawsuit

In article <CKq1Fu.Fq7@ucdavis.edu>,

Daniel D. Todd <ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu> wrote:

>A great x ray technician! (xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:

>: Abolish ALL testing.

>Is this what you believe?

Perhaps you should direct that question to the biggest whiner
in this newsgroup, Dan Pickersgill.

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #40
